

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Office Action of June 10, 2003.

In the specification, amendments have been made to correct minor editorial problems. In particular, the amendments to pages 1 and 6 are being made to ensure that the Specification is consistent with the formal drawings. The amendments to page 11 are being made to make the descriptions of the first and second fields consistent with that of the third field.

Claims 1-9 remain in this application. Claims 7 and 8 have been allowed. Claim 1 adds an additional feature from the specification.

Claims 1-6, 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bock, et al. (6,417,868) in view of Borel, et al. (6,252,613).

Regarding claim 1, as noted by the Examiner, Bock does not disclose “distinct sets containing different sub-pixels.” The result of selecting such distinct sets of sub-pixels is that each has a different center equally spaced within a frame of video data, thereby improving the resolution beyond that defined by the larger sub-pixel set from which the sub-pixels are selected. There is an inherent requirement that the centers of the sub-pixel sets be evenly spaced in order to improve resolution, while preserving a time-averaged uniform resolution across the display. Since Bock uses different sized sub-pixels to achieve more gray levels, it teaches away from having sub-pixel sets with equally spaced centers.

Borel teaches selecting different sub-pixel sets within a frame to achieve a better balance between vertical and horizontal resolution. However, only two sets are provided within each frame, since that is all that is required to improve the vertical resolution. By “selecting distinct sets of sub-

pixels for each of a set *of at least three sub-frames* within a frame of said video data," as provided in amended claim 1, the horizontal resolution is improved. Thus, the number of addressing columns is reduced substantially when compared to the prior art without impairing horizontal resolution and also the energy efficiency of the display is improved.

Accordingly, claim 1 and claims 2-6 and 9, which depend therefrom, are in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & MCKEE, *LLP*

By: *Timothy E. Nauman*
Timothy E. Nauman, Reg. No. 32,283
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
Phone 216-861-5582
Fax 216-241-1666